UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1991/22
15 March 1991

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Thirty-eighth session
3-21 June 1991, New York
Item 4 (b) of the provisional agenda

SUPPORT

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

EVALUATION

Report of the Administrator

SUMMARY

This is the eighth annual report on evaluation. It reflects the continuing shift of the work of the Central Evaluation Office (CEO) of the Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation (BPPE) in the last few years from system development to programme analysis. In section II, it summarizes the major evaluation work carried out and brings certain issues to the attention of the Governing Council based on the lessons of the evaluations, in particular those of Social Dimensions of Adjustment, aid coordination capacity and national technical cooperation assessment and programmes (NATCAPs). Section III contains a discussion of the feedback of evaluation results into the work of UNDP; section IV records what has been done to promote national monitoring and evaluation systems; section V covers collaboration with other institutions, Governments and the executing agencies; and section VI lays out the evaluation work planned for 1991. The work plan of CEO for 1991 appears in the annex.

CONTENTS

		Paragraphs	Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1 - 2	3
II.	MAJOR EVALUATIONS	3 - 40	3
III.	INTEGRATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS (FEEDBACK)	41 - 49	10
IV.	GOVERNMENT MONITORING AND EVALUATION CAPACITY	50 - 52	12
V.	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	53 - 57	13
VI.	WORK PLAN FOR 1991	58 - 63	14
Annex.	Work plan of the Central Evaluation Office for 1991		15

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is the eighth annual report on evaluation, submitted in response to Governing Council decision 83/12 of 24 June 1983, in which the Council requested information on the arrangements for the evaluation of the programme. The report reflects the continuing shift of the work of the Central Evaluation Office (CEO) of the Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation (BPPE) in the last few years from system development to programme analysis.

2. The evolution in the work of CEO is reflected in the report, which draws to the Governing Council's attention some of the substantive issues raised by the evaluations that have been undertaken. This evolution appears to be timely as one cycle of assistance is completed and another begins, during which United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) assistance will be focused on national capacity-building in six specific areas related to human development. Accordingly, evaluations and related activities will be increasingly oriented to assessing the overall effectiveness of the organization.

II. MAJOR EVALUATIONS

3. Three evaluations, undertaken directly by CEO or with significant office involvement in 1990, concerned national technical cooperation assessment and programmes (NATCAPs), Social Dimensions of Adjustment (SDA) and aid coordination capacity in least developed countries (LDCs). All were requested by the Governing Council. Other major exercises dealt with metrology, disaster and development, and urbanization. Each one is reviewed briefly below, along with some issues that emerge both from these evaluations and from the ensemble of evaluation work done within UNDP.

4. NATCAPs. Begun on a pilot basis in 10 countries in 1986, NATCAPs have been initiated in more than 30 countries in Africa. The four essential aspects of the NaTCAP process are: (a) establishment of a database for technical cooperation; (b) preparation of a technical cooperation framework paper to guide national policy with respect to technical cooperation; (c) drawing up a technical cooperation programme linked with other planning instruments such as the Public Investment Programme; and (d) long-run strengthening of the institutional framework for technical cooperation. As a new initiative, the NaTCAP process was subjected to an initial review by CEO in 1987 and the report was made available to the Governing Council as a conference room paper in June 1988.

5. This evaluation was requested by the Governing Council in decision 89/35 of 30 June 1989 in the context of UNDP support for the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development 1986-1990 (UNPAAERD). Completion was due early in 1991. An initial desk phase was followed up by fieldwork in Ghana, Guinea, Chad, Malawi and Zambia. The full report of the evaluation will be made available separately to the Council. However, the preliminary results available in January 1991 suggest that the NaTCAP process remains a viable and valuable instrument that can support the more selective and

substantive programming required by programmes focusing on human development. The technique has already been used to good effect but its potential is not yet fully realized.

6. For example, in the first country in which the NATCAP process has been completed, the evaluation indicated that, by rationalizing inconsistencies in the supply of expatriate manpower, the country had, over a period of three years, reduced its total expenditures for technical assistance from $80 million to $60 million. The Ministry of Planning was of the view that $5 million of this $20 million was a real savings, resulting from elimination of duplication and of assistance that was no longer justified. The other $15 million was due to a reallocation of aid as a result of restrictions on the Government's budget. This NATCAP has cost $250,000 to date. It therefore appears to have been cost-effective in promoting the rational allocation of resources.

7. That particular exercise focused on the use of expatriate manpower in the short run. It did not undertake a strategic analysis of institutional and human resource needs in the medium and long term. Future exercises which do so may well be even more profitable.

8. NATCAPs can be used to good effect as a means of dispensing with a surfeit of expatriate personnel. It appears however that it is better to use them to define, comprehensively and at a national level, what capacities are needed, in terms of human skills and institutions, if the country is to accelerate its development steadily in the medium and long term. The potential for increasing the cost-effectiveness, scope and impact of technical cooperation, if the process is taken to this logical conclusion, is considerable and seems to be, as yet, unrealized.

9. In more operational terms, the challenges for NATCAP are several: first, to perfect the programming methodology; secondly, to ensure that the emphasis is kept squarely on human and institutional development; and thirdly, to meet the need for strengthening Governments' ownership and UNDP's backstopping of the process.

10. Social Dimensions of Adjustment. This is a joint undertaking of the World Bank, the African Development Bank and UNDP. It was conceived in 1986 as a response to concerns about the social costs of adjustment in sub-Saharan Africa and about the relative inadequacy of national institutional capacities for policy analysis, design and implementation to promote equitable development.

11. It sought to strengthen the capacities of participating countries: (a) to design and implement social policies and programmes; (b) to analyse the evolution over time of the socio-economic conditions of different population groups in response to measures of economic reform and provide the basis for designing specific policy reforms and projects; and (c) to develop and maintain adequate information systems for these purposes.

12. Activities fell into two broad categories: social action programmes and surveys and statistics for the establishment of databases. The World Bank was designated as the executing agency. The initial contribution of $US 10 million was

provided by UNDP ($US 5 million), the World Bank ($US 2.5 million, in kind) and the African Development Bank ($US 2.5 million). Viewed initially as an experimental effort with limited financing, the original plan was to cover 10 countries of sub-Saharan Africa. The response to the project was very strong and the number of participating countries rose to over 30.

13. The evaluation, also requested by the Governing Council in the context of UNDP support for UNPAAERD, was undertaken by an independent team. It took place from May to November 1990 and involved desk work at the headquarters of the co-sponsoring institutions and field visits to five countries: Cameroon, Ghana, Madagascar, Malawi and the United Republic of Tanzania. Its purpose was to provide an independent and systematic review of ongoing activities and to make recommendations for their future direction and management.

14. The evaluation concluded that the two main thrusts of the SDA programme are not linked, the data -athering component of the programme is not useful to African Governments, and the social action programmes are open-ended and unmonitorable and ignore experience gained elsewhere by the World Bank. The evaluation argued that financing SDA components, which do not contribute directly to the productive capacity of the economy, through loans instead of grants is undesirable on economic grounds. It expressed concern at the oversight and supervision of the project and recommended that, if the SDA programme were to be continued at all, after completion of the present phase at the end of fiscal year 1991 there should be major changes in focus and organizational structure. The Administrator's response to these issues is contained in the note regarding the evaluation reports to the Governing Council (DP/1991/17).

15. The topic is noteworthy not least because of its direct linkage with the question of how to operationalize support to capacity-building for human development. The evaluation should therefore be seen as a precursor of the kind of approach that UNDP will need to apply more widely as it responds to the directions contained in General Assembly resolution 44/211 of 22 December 1989 and Governing Council decision 90/34 of 23 June 1990.

16. In retrospect, one shortcoming of the evaluation is that it did not pursue sufficiently some of the more overarching issues posed by the emergence of human development as a central concern of UNDP. Neither did it examine whether the three collaborating institutions were following up in the field the important issues of the direction and efficiency of expenditure posed in the Human Development Report. In the future, evaluations will need to address these kinds of questions and CEO will need to gear itself accordingly.

17. Aid coordination capacity in least developed countries. The Governing Council, by decision 90/51 of 22 June 1990, requested the Administrator to evaluate UNDP's contribution to strengthening the capacity of LDCs in coordinating their external assistance and to make recommendations for the future. The LDCs have been given a greater priority in the fifth cycle, and the share of indicative planning figure (IPF) resources now allocated by UNDP to them for the fifth cycle amounts to 55 per cent.

18. Aid coordination is a key issue for both the aid community and LDCs. Improving the effectiveness and impact of external assistance is an objective in any recipient country but in the case of the LDCs this objective is far more crucial, as the volume of external resources often represents an important share of the total resources available for development.

19. The primary responsibility for the coordination of aid lies with the Governments of the countries that receive aid, and the ultimate objective of any external assistance in this area should be to build sustainable national capacity in those countries. The evaluation therefore examined not only the coordination mechanisms but also covered the capacity to link aid with macroeconomic policies, sectoral development plans governing the allocation of resources and planning for external assistance. It also assessed the impact and sustainability of the results, primarily from the perspective of the recipients and secondarily from the standpoint of UNDP or other donors.

20. Following preliminary deskwork in New York, the fieldwork began in November 1990 with visits by four independent consultants to Cape Verde, Ethiopia, Nepal, the Niger, Togo, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Western Samoa and Yemen. In addition, some donor countries were visited: Canada, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

21. The evaluation will be completed by June 1991. It will highlight the positive and negative aspects of UNDP assistance and recommend ways of improving it and, if justified and feasible, methods for further development and the extension of UNDP's involvement in this area. The report of the evaluation is being made available separately to the Governing Council.

Cross-cutting issues emerging from evaluations

22. Response to central policy issues. Policy issues such as the social consequences of economic adjustment or coordination of aid are very active questions for many countries and for many development institutions. The experience with aid coordination capacity, NATCAPs and SDA seems to affirm the suggestion that, if UNDP is to play a role in such central areas, it needs to have a greater substantive capacity to deal with such questions.

23. Sustainability of institutions. In his report on evaluation to the Governing Council at its thirty-seventh session (DP/1990/34, paras. 18 and 19), the Administrator summarized the results of an ex post study in Cameroon of three institutions which had received UNDP technical assistance over a long period. The evaluation focused on several aspects of institutional capacity: performance, efficiency, effectiveness, potential for development, impact and sustainability. It found that, with certain caveats, two of the institutions appeared to be justified and viable. Both had reached a stage of development which allowed them to perform their current activities without external assistance.

24. However, during the SDA evaluation it emerged that, as part of the economic reform process in Cameroon, the Government had decided to dissolve both of these institutions. Given the long-term nature of much institution-building, this

suggests that UNDP should analyse very carefully the potential sustainability and survivability of the institutions, whose strengthening it is currently considering or already supporting, particularly in those countries where the process of economic reform is most active. In operational evaluation terms this suggests that the issue be reflected in a significant way in the terms of reference for the evaluation of any institution-building project.

25. Joint programmes. Where UNDP is engaged in joint programmes with other major development institutions which have well developed views on the issues in question, great care needs to be taken, both at the outset and during execution, to ensure community of objectives and approach in implementing the initiative.

26. Integrating emerging concerns into UNDP operations. The three evaluations discussed above - NATCAPs, SDA and aid coordination capacity in LDCs - all suggest that UNDP faces important choices in integrating emerging development concerns into its regular operations. In some instances but not in all, UNDP has created special units as a means of addressing such specific concerns. This raises questions such as: under what conditions is the creation of a special unit, which is dedicated to respond to a specific developmental concern, the optimal solution and what are the alternatives to such a unit? What kind of capacities should such units have and what is the minimal critical mass necessary for them to ensure an appropriate and effective response by UNDP? What is the life cycle of such units? Finally, how many emerging concerns can be integrated into UNDP activities at any one time and how well do they support the core message of human development and the strengthening of national capacity? The topic is worthy of further study and will be kept under review in ongoing evaluation work.

Other evaluations

27. Metrology. UNDP is engaged in a "mini-thematic evaluation" of metrology projects. A full thematic evaluation is a time-consuming and costly exercise. This mini-thematic evaluation, undertaken in consultation with the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), is an effort to produce quick, cheap and useful lessons and guidance in a subsector which has significant linkages with environment, health, quality control and consumer protection. To date UNDP/UNIDO have supported some 70 projects in metrology with a total contribution of $US 30,000,000.

28. Implemented in a phased approach, some basic hypotheses were developed and then tested. The fieldwork of the evaluation will be analysed by a seminar of experts in the subject. The seminar will consider how the relationship between a country's level of development and other external factors affects the design of such projects, the role of the private sector as well as new concepts, approaches and modalities for this kind of assistance. The results of the evaluation will be reported to the Governing Council at its thirty-ninth session in 1992, and a programme advisory note will be prepared and an issue of Findings circulated to promote the dissemination of the lessons learned.

29. Disaster and development. An assessment of disaster and development started in May 1990 with a preparatory review of the impact of long, recurrent disasters on economic development of countries affected by such phenomena. This was followed by

country studies in Bangladesh, Ethiopia and Ecuador carried out by nationals. The experience and lessons learned from the Sudan, Colombia and India were also used.

30. The main findings are that:

(a) Governments are willing and able to develop strategies linking development to measures which mitigate their vulnerability to disaster, but because other priorities emerge as disasters fade from memory, long-term orientation and assistance are required;

(b) Many government and other officials still find it difficult to focus on "prevention and mitigation" as separate from "relief and reconstruction";

(c) Planners in key organizations lack essential technical information to take disaster vulnerability into account and to integrate disaster concerns with development planning;

(d) Many Governments fail to recognize that disasters can be mitigated at minimal cost by adjustments to ongoing development programmes.

31. The assessment recommended that UNDP should help Governments to quantify the extent of their vulnerability to disasters; to identify existing key government institutions to strengthen; to design information systems that will give planners easy access to information on hazards; and to identify ongoing development projects that could be adjusted before completion, to take disaster mitigation concerns more completely into account.

32. Urbanization. A thematic review of urban projects has been carried out jointly by the Technical Advisory Division of BPPE and CEO. The purpose was, first, to understand better the contribution of UNDP assistance to strengthening the capacity of institutions to deal with problems and opportunities associated with urbanization; and secondly, to provide insights about the implementation of UNDP projects and their contribution to urban development that will help UNDP to assess its strategic position in providing assistance in the future.

33. The results of this exercise are being disseminated to policy makers in developing countries as well as to operational units within UNDP. The review recommended that:

(a) UNDP should respond to Governments by encouraging a programme approach to providing assistance and adopt an enabling strategy so that its resources act as a catalyst both for action and for resource mobilization;

(b) The enabling strategy should support four critical issues identified in the Human Development Report 1990: decentralizing power and resources from the central government to municipalities; mobilizing municipal revenue from local sources; emphasizing enabling strategies for shelter and infrastructure; and improving the urban environment, especially for the vast majority of urban poor in slums and squatter settlements;

(c) The primary objectives of UNDP programmes and projects in the urban sector should be redirected to strengthening the institutional capacity of public and private organizations in developing countries to address urbanization issues and away from solving specific technical problems;

(d) Greater use be made of organizations in developing countries, both government and private;

(e) A more participatory approach to urban development activities is necessary in which communities take greater responsibility through self-help for solving problems and pursuing opportunities;

(f) UNDP and Governments in developing countries should do much more to involve non-governmental organizations, community groups and the private sector in coping with urban development problems and opportunities.

34. Participatory evaluation. CEO undertook a review of participatory evaluation in 1989 and reported on it to the Governing Council in 1990 (DP/1990/34). Participatory evaluation, i.e., evaluation conducted by the users and beneficiaries of a project, will have an increasingly important place in UNDP evaluation activities. The approach is worth exploring because it may increase the likelihood that the data and analysis, upon which an evaluation report is based, genuinely reflect the facts, as seen by those most affected by the project. Further, by encouraging the beneficiaries to assess their situation and needs, it may help to empower them and give them ways to improve other aspects of their lives.

35. While it has been argued that only participatory projects can be the subject of participatory evaluation, CEO is examining the extent to which it can be applied to a broad variety of projects and programmes. The first step is a series of case studies to gain more experience in the use of this approach. A project on post-harvest losses control in Zambia has been selected as the first example. The evaluation exercise will be carried out by the community of beneficiaries with some assistance from local researchers and the UNDP field office, and the results should be ready by the end of July 1991.

Other evaluation work

36. United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office (UNSO). At the request of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and UNDP, an evaluation of the UNEP/UNDP Joint Venture support to UNSO from 1979 to 1989 was completed in 1990. The evaluation report recognized the impact of UNSO's achievements of the past 10 years. It recommended that the Joint Venture be continued and increased. In addition, UNSO fielded seven evaluation missions of ongoing projects, which investigated the project relevance, efficiency and effectiveness. They also assessed whether project results would be sustainable.

37. United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM). In an effort to improve the quality of its programming, UNIFEM has streamlined guidelines for programme and project development, appraisal and approval. Its particular emphasis on monitoring

and evaluation is derived from its mandate to be experimental, to test new approaches and to document the process and product of project experience.

38. The main evaluation activities of 1990 include desk and field reviews of UNIFEM's efforts to integrate the concerns of women into the mainstream of development in the period 1985-1990. This resulted in the publication of a book entitled Women on the Agenda, which derives lessons for future strategies and approaches. UNIFEM also contributed to studies of participatory evaluation exercises, a participatory evaluation model based on a community development project it supports in Lesotho. The model was conceived after thorough analysis of experiences of previous experiments in participatory approaches. The evaluation demonstrated that community response becomes effective and sustained when people are allowed to participate in planning and implementation of their activities.

39. UNIFEM has been financing gender training with the assumption that gender-sensitized policy makers and programmers will take effective action to incorporate women in mainstream development. UNIFEM is now preparing an assessment of this training. The training will be analysed, drawing on quantitative and qualitative indicators, to estimate its impact on development programming and on women's participation in mainstream development.

40. United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF). Three programme-level evaluations have been carried out and regular scrutiny of projects, via ongoing and terminal evaluations, continues. UNCDF activities in agriculture have been examined in a desk review, as have UNCDF-supported activities in water supply and sanitation and support for irrigation activities in the United Republic of Tanzania. The results of all these evaluations have been disseminated to UNCDF staff through workshops, documents and review meetings.

III. INTEGRATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS (FEEDBACK)

41. The work of the funds, as well as the regular evaluation activities undertaken by the regional bureaux as part of their management of the programme, demonstrates a slow but steady increase in the use of evaluation in UNDP. Furthermore the results of relevant evaluation reports are now routinely brought to the Action Committee. The Committee has requested, on several occasions, that mid-term participatory evaluations be included in the project as a condition for approval. It has also requested a number of specific evaluations, for example, high-technology projects in China and India and an assessment of the experience with umbrella projects in China. All in all, evaluation is being used as a tool of management.

42. During the past four years CEO has received the following numbers of project evaluation reports:

	1987	1988	1989	1990
Type of evaluation				
Mid-term	52	52	61	104
Terminal	94	93	110	77
Ex post	9	5	8	2
Total	155	150	179	183
Cluster	2	3	6	3

The figures for 1990 are subject to a modest upward revision as some evaluation reports completed late in the year may not have reached the Office at the time the present report was prepared.

43. The number of evaluations performed annually continues to be fairly stable. Terminal evaluations used to be the most common. However, in 1990 there was a shift towards mid-term evaluations and away from terminal evaluations. This appears to reflect requirements for mid-term evaluation established by the Action Committee at the time of project approval. The number of cluster evaluations remains low. As such exercises are a cost-effective means of covering multiple projects in one evaluation and facilitate programme-level assessments of the whole group of projects, it is to be hoped that use of this modality will increase in the future. CEO will pursue this question further with operational units concerned. The development of ex post evaluation continues to suffer from the difficulty of funding this type of evaluation with IPF country resources.

44. The results of evaluations are continuously fed into UNDP's evaluation database. As of the end of 1990, some 530 project evaluations had been analysed and entered in it. The database has now been made readily available to operational staff via the local area computer network. Its use and usefulness will be monitored during the year to see how effective the database is.

45. Nevertheless the issue of feedback remains an ongoing concern. This report therefore reiterates a subject already presented to the Governing Council in previous years but which still remains significant both to UNDP and to other donors, ensuring follow-up of evaluations and the integration of their results into the programme and project cycle. At the operational level managers do take account of the findings and recommendations of evaluations. However, broader lessons from the body of UNDP's work are only rarely being drawn.

46. The experience of CEO is that evaluations are more likely to produce usable lessons when they consider issues beyond the immediate boundaries of the project and assess clearly the contribution of projects or programmes to the sector or subsector concerned. One ongoing concern for CEO is therefore to raise the focus of evaluations so that they assess more clearly this contribution of projects or programmes to development. This can be achieved by several means, including cluster evaluations, improved terms of reference as well as continuing attention to

the quality of evaluation reports and relevant feedback by CEO to operational units concerned. These matters will continue to be pursued by CEO in collaboration with the operational units concerned.

47. Another means of promoting effective application of evaluation lessons is the involvement of government in the evaluation of technical cooperation. This is a principle upon which UNDP's evaluation system has insisted from its inception. Also the CEO's work plan has, from the time the Office was established, involved strengthening Governments' evaluation capacity, including their ability to disseminate and apply the findings of evaluations to their own development programmes. It will continue to do so.

48. Consistency of assessments within evaluation reports. CEO has analysed the terminal evaluation reports produced by UNDP's operational units for some 280 projects. The particular focus has been the consistency of assessments made about the success of projects. In making their assessments about project success, evaluations are expected to examine five aspects of project performance: achievement of objectives, production of outputs, contribution to institution-building, whether beneficiaries have been reached and sustainability of project results.

49. The analysis showed that evaluations are more generous in their judgements about overall project success than they are in their assessments of performance under these five categories. The implications of this analysis are being explored with operational units so as to ensure that assessments of project performance are internally consistent. Once these discussions are completed, the outcome will be reflected in the briefings given to evaluation missions and, if necessary, in the evaluation guidelines.

IV. GOVERNMENT MONITORING AND EVALUATION CAPACITY

50. The strengthening of national monitoring and evaluation capacity was urged by the General Assembly in resolution 38/171 of 19 December 1983 and is part of the original mandate of CEO. Governments need to have a better understanding of the effect of their programmes on their people. UNDP has been active in promoting this issue with both donors and recipients. Monographs which describe the monitoring and evaluation systems that exist in a number of countries are being produced. They compare different approaches and demonstrate the possibilities for cooperation between different countries.

51. The monographs for Côte d'Ivoire, Malaysia, Morocco and Zimbabwe have been published and sent to UNDP field offices as an input to their dialogue with government over this significant aspect of development management. The preparation of the Moroccan paper was followed by a seminar with government officials concerning follow-up action.

52. Papers based on these monographs and on UNDP's overall approach to these issues were a significant input to a seminar organized by the Development

Assistance Committee (DAC)/Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the African Development Bank at Abidjan in May 1990. Representatives of African Governments and of donor evaluation offices participated and the seminar was perceived to be useful by both. A similar seminar for the Asian and Pacific region is envisaged for early 1992.

V. EXTERNAL RELATIONS

53. Joint evaluations. It has been generally agreed that joint evaluations between bilateral and multilateral institutions are a sound way of promoting transparency of the United Nations system. UNDP has agreed to consolidate the evaluation plans of the United Nations agencies as a first step in identifying topics that may be of common interest to concerned Governments.

54. Joint evaluations were carried out in 1990 by UNDP with the Government of Japan in Bolivia and Malaysia, examining institution-building and human resources development. Australia and UNDP plan to carry out a joint evaluation of selected rural development projects in South-East Asia. The particular focus will be to define the most effective contribution that external assistance can bring to the less advanced regions of relatively advanced developing countries. UNDP continues to explore other topics of joint interest with other Governments.

55. The Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation (IAWG). The Working Group was scheduled to meet at Geneva in the first quarter of 1991 to discuss ongoing collaboration. Topics of particular mutual concern are feedback, programme monitoring and evaluation, the monitoring of nationally executed projects and the evaluation of headquarters programmes. The Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) was to participate actively in this meeting and requested the Group to consider establishing guidelines on what should be considered an appropriate proportion of expenditure on evaluation for any programme or project.

56. Evaluation of and with multilateral organizations. Given the increasing interest within the DAC/OECD group in using joint evaluations with United Nations agencies, an approach paper was prepared by the Government of Norway for DAC/OECD on the evaluation of multilateral assistance and it was, at their request, circulated for comment to the agencies of the United Nations system.

57. In general, the agencies welcomed the active donor interest and involvement. At the same time, however, there was some apprehension that individual donor objectives, including those of DAC members, were not necessarily consistent with those pursued by the United Nations agencies, nor were they necessarily consistent between different donors. These comments have been synthesized by UNDP and sent to the authors of the paper for their consideration.

VI. WORK PLAN FOR 1991

58. A new strategy for evaluation. The increased focus of UNDP on human development and the six focus areas related to it means that evaluation work in UNDP will have to take on a new dimension. Evaluations will need to be oriented to assessing the overall effectiveness of the organization in promoting the development of national capacity via these six areas.

59. As long as the project remains the basic vehicle through which assistance is conveyed, the operational units, which, in UNDP's decentralized system, have the first line responsibility for quality control, will continue to use the traditional monitoring and evaluation instruments. However, the traditional system will need to be enhanced both at the "operational" level, by greater attention to monitoring project effects on programme goals and targets, and at the "centre" by more policy-focused evaluations.

60. For the former, CEO will help to develop operational criteria for monitoring and evaluating programmes and projects in the future, based on the areas of focus affirmed by the Governing Council and the analysis and indices already developed in the Human Development Report. This material will be provided to the field as soon as it is developed. The more policy-focused evaluations would address the same kind of questions of impact on human development and of organizational focus and capacity, as for example in the evaluation of the Social Dimensions of Adjustment in Africa and in the ex post assessment of UNDP's contribution to institution-building in Cameroon, already reported on in the 1990 report on evaluation (DP/1990/34, paras. 18 and 19).

61. Thematic and cluster evaluations will need to be carried out during the fifth cycle for each of the areas of focus laid out in Governing Council decision 90/34. A mix of policy and process evaluations is foreseen. As greater priority is being given to assistance to the least developed countries, more attention will need to be given to evaluating relevant UNDP efforts there. CEO also plans studies on new approaches and mechanisms for the programming and delivery of technical cooperation.

62. In order to enable CEO to respond to a widening variety of substantive concerns, $US 7 million of Special Programme Resources (SPR) are foreseen for programme evaluation and training in the fifth cycle. These resources will be used for programme, policy and process evaluations which will support the new thrusts of UNDP activities. In addition, CEO will continue to assist all UNDP units and funds in carrying out major evaluations.

63. In summary, the evaluation work programme will be linked more closely to that of the operational units in UNDP, and CEO expects to pursue a more demand driven role, within the framework of the areas of concentration in support of human development. Specific tasks planned for 1991 are listed in the annexed work plan.

Annex

WORK PLAN OF THE CENTRAL EVALUATION OFFICE FOR 1991

Evaluation themes		Outputs	
		I. SUPPORT TO CENTRAL FOCI	
1.1	Evaluation work in support of the six focus areas	1.1.1	Guidelines for monitoring and evaluation of the six thematic programmes at the global and country levels
		1.1.2	Country case studies: Algeria, Togo and one other country
1.a.1	Participatory development	1.a.1.1	Two case studies: Zambia and another country
		1.a.1.2	Guidelines for participatory evaluation
1.a.2	Poverty eradication	1.a.2.1	Report for Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean
		1.a.2.2	Guidelines for analysis of target groups
1.b.1	Environmental institution-building	1.b.1.1	Case study: Indonesia
1.c.1	National capacity in monitoring and evaluation	1.c.1.1	Country study reports: India, Sri Lanka, Uganda and two other countries
		1.c.1.2	Advisory services for Morocco
1.c.2	National execution	1.c.2.1	Training for the Sudan
		1.c.2.2	Report on ad hoc units for national execution
1.c.3	Training of government officials	1.c.3.1	Training courses: Ethiopia, Guinea and Mongolia

	Evaluation themes		Outputs
1.d.1	Technical assistance approaches review	1.d.1.1	Mini-thematic evaluation report
		1.d.1.2	High-technology projects evaluation report
		1.d.1.3	Review of umbrella project in China
	II. IMPROVEMENT OF TECHNIQUES		
2.1	Cost-effectiveness of technical cooperation	2.1.1	Issue of paper and case studies
2.2	Improvement of quality of terms of reference	2.2.1	Lessons on institution-building (Development Assistance Committee (DAC) questions)
		2.2.2	Terms of reference for institution-building project
2.3	Institutional development	2.3.1	Three country reports: Cameroon, Uganda and one East European country
	III. PROGRAMME POLICY AND PROCESS EVALUATIONS		
3.1	Disaster and development	3.1.1	Study on relationship between disaster and institution-building
		3.1.2	Training of UNDP staff by CEO
3.2	Aid coordination in least developed countries	3.2.1	Evaluation report
3.3	Development planning	3.3.1	Evaluation report
3.4	Public reform sector reform	3.4.1	Mini-thematic report for RBLAC
3.5	Support costs	3.5.1	Monitoring and evaluation system
3.6	Metrology	3.6.1	Report

	Evaluation themes		Outputs
3.7	Pisciculture	3.7.1	Report
3.8	Special public works programme	3.8.1	Report
3.9	Use of equipment	3.9.1	Report
3.10	Integrating emerging concerns	3.10.1	Report
3.11	Management system for UNDP's monitoring/evaluation activities	3.11.1	Report

IV. FEEDBACK

4.1	Development of evaluation data bank	4.1.1	Organization of the maintenance system
		4.1.2	Data bank of terminal reports
		4.1.3	Data bank of basic principles
		4.1.4	Statistical analysis
		4.1.5	Identification of needs of regional bureaux and funds
		4.1.6	Training of UNDP staff
4.2	Dissemination of lessons	4.2.1	Programme advisory note on trade policy
		4.2.2	Eight issues of Findings
			Aid coordination
			Twinning arrangements
			High-technology projects
			Metrology
			SDA
			NATCAP
			Government monitoring and evaluation in Africa
			Urbanization

Evaluation themes		Outputs	
		V. BACKSTOPPING	
5.1	Direct support to regional bureaux	5.1.2	Backstopping activities
			Review of evaluation reports
			Review of terms of reference, briefing and debriefing of consultants
			Participation in Project Appraisal Committee (PAC) meetings
			Eight training courses
			Preparation of Action Committee briefs
			Participation in project evaluation
		VI. EXTERNAL RELATIONS	
6.1	Joint evaluations	6.1.1	With Australia on rural development
6.2	Accountability of the Administrator	6.2.1	Reports to the Governing Council
		6.2.1.1	1990 annual report
		6.2.1.2	Aid coordination report
		6.2.1.3	SDA report
6.3	Relationships with United Nations agencies	6.3.1.1	Papers for the Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation Feedback, monitoring and evaluation of nationally executed projects
			Programme evaluation

Evaluation themes		Outputs	
6.4	Relationship with DAC expert group on evaluation	6.4.1.1	Papers for DAC meeting in March 1991
			Synthesis of United Nations agencies evaluation plans
			Evaluation of multilateral agencies
			Evaluation reports inventories
		6.4.1.2	Papers for DAC seminar (Government monitoring and evaluation in Asia)

VII. SPECIAL TASKS

7.1	Disaster and development	7.1.2	Training of trainer and courses

---